

Comment on "Evidence for Coexistence of the Gap and the Pseudogap in Bi-2212 from Intrinsic Tunneling Spectroscopy"

M.Ya. Amusia^{a,b} and V.R. Shaginyan^c *

^a The Racah Institute of Physics, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel;

^b Physical-Technical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, 194021 St. Petersburg, Russia;

^c Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Gatchina, 188350, Russia

It is argued that the superconducting and pseudogaps represent different coexisting phenomena, and this observation speaks against the precursor-superconductivity scenario of the pseudogap [1]. We present brief comments showing that the experimental facts of paper [1] do not contradict to observations that the pseudogap in underdoped Bi-2212 smoothly evolves into a pseudogap above critical temperature T_c [2–4], and the large energy gap below T_c is mainly of superconducting origin [5]. We show that appearance of this pseudogap is closely related to a new energy scale observed recently [6].

PACS numbers: 74.25.Jb, 71.27.+a, 74.20.Fg

In a recent Letter [1], Krasnov *et al.*, using the intrinsic tunneling spectroscopy, observed on small slightly overdoped and optimally doped $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ (Bi-2212) mesas that the superconducting gap (SG) does vanish, while the pseudogap (PG) does not change at $T = T_c$. As a result, they claim that all this speaks in favor of different origin of two coexisting phenomena and against the precursor-superconductivity scenario of the PG. On the other hand, basing on angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES), accurate measurements gave firm evidence that in optimally doped and overdoped samples, a d-wave superconducting gap closes at the same temperature, T_c . However, in underdoped samples, the SG below T_c smoothly evolves into a PG above T_c [2–4]. Moreover, detailed examination of the tunneling spectra over wide doping range show that the large energy gaps are predominantly of superconducting origin [5]. Thus, the main results of [2–5] are in conflict with the ones of [1], and we face a number of contradictions. For instance, we have both negative and positive answers to at least the following statements: 1) the PG exists in optimally doped samples; 2) there is no direct relation between the SG and the PG; 3) the SG does not smoothly evolve into the PG; and 4) the energy gap at $T \leq T_c$ is composed from the SG and PG. In our Comment we show that these contradictions are only visible and explain the origin of PG described in [1].

For the readers convenience, we summarize here the main experimental results of [1].

At low T , the data show a sharp peak in the dynamic conductance $\sigma(v)$, which is attributed to the SG voltage, $v_s = 2\Delta_s/e$ (our notations correspond to that in [1]). With increasing T , the peak at v_s reduces in amplitude and shifts to lower voltages, reflecting the decrease in $\Delta_s(T)$, while $2\Delta_s(T = 0) \simeq 66$ meV. At $T \simeq 83$ K

($< T_c \simeq 93$ K) the superconducting peak is smeared out completely and a hump in conductance at $v = v_{pg} \simeq 70$ meV remains. Then, there are no sharp changes at T_c . The PG persists in the superconducting state. At $T < T_c$ with decreasing temperature, the superconducting peak shifts to higher voltages, increases in amplitude, and eventually the PG hump is washed out by much stronger superconducting peak. For optimally doped mesas, the PG hump can be resolved at $T > 60$ K, i.e., well below T_c .

Now we turn to a consideration of the cited above experimental results related to the peak at v_{pg} . Recently a new energy scale for quasiparticle dispersion in superconducting and normal states of Bi-2212 was discovered, which manifests itself as a break in the quasiparticle dispersion near 50 ± 15 meV binding energy E_0 [6] that results in a change in the quasiparticle velocity. An explanation of these experimental findings was given in [7,8] which relates the scale E_0 to the SG, $E_0 \simeq 2\Delta_1$, with Δ_1 being the maximum superconducting gap at $T = 0$. The appearance of this scale is a consequence of the fermion condensation: a quantum phase transition which can take place in high temperature superconductors [9]. At $T \leq T_c \ll T_f$ the scale E_0 is approximately temperature independent. At $T_c \leq T \ll T_f$, we have $E_0 \simeq 4T$ if there is no pseudogap which evolves from the SG as discussed in [2–4]. Otherwise T_c is substituted by the temperature T^* above which the pseudogap closes. Here T_f is the temperature, about which the fermion condensation effects vanish. Thus, the quasiparticle dispersion can be presented by two straight lines, characterized by effective masses M_{FC} and M_L , and intersecting near the binding energy E_0 . The slower dispersing low energy part is defined by M_{FC} , while M_L defines the faster dispersing high energy part. In the region where the SG reaches its

*E-mail: vrshag@thd.pnpi.spb.ru

maximum value Δ_1 the ratio $M_L/M_{FC} \ll 1$ leading to a strong change in the density of states at $E_0 \simeq 2\Delta_1$. We can now conclude that at $T_c \leq T$, it is the scale E_0 that produces a hump in conductance at $v = v_s \simeq 70$ meV $\simeq 2\Delta_1$. At $T \leq T_c$, the superconducting peak emerges. With decreasing temperature it moves to higher energies until it reaches its maximum value $2\Delta_1$ merging with the scale E_0 .

In conclusion, we see that PG observed in [1] is related to the scale E_0 and therefore this PG has a nature different from the one described in [2–4]. This PG does not contradict to statement that SG does smoothly evolve into the PG, and there is no grounds to think that the energy gap at $T \leq T_c$ is composed from the SG and PG. We are led to a conclusion that the main results of papers [2–5] are not at variance with experimental findings of [1]. The main result of [1] can be interpreted as an independent confirmation of the existence of a new en-

ergy scale at temperatures below and above T_c which was firstly observed in [6].

- [1] V.M. Krasnov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5860 (2000).
- [2] H. Ding *et al.*, Nature **382**, 51 (1996).
- [3] A.G. Loeser *et al.*, Science **273**, 325 (1996).
- [4] M.R. Norman *et al.*, Nature **392**, 157 (1998).
- [5] N. Miyakawa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1018 (1999).
- [6] P.V. Bogdanov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2581 (2000).
- [7] M.Ya. Amusia, V.R. Shaginyan, Phys. Lett. A **275**, 124 (2000).
- [8] S.A. Artamonov and V.R. Shaginyan, JETP **92**, 287 (2001).
- [9] M.Ya. Amusia, V.R. Shaginyan, cond-mat/0102229.